

The Rev^d Charles Edward Stewart, the Author of this Pamphlet, was born at Long Melford: He was Rector of Wake's Church, in Essex, & of Reed in Suffolk, & Chaplain to the Earl of Suffolk. He died in 1819. & was bur^d. at Long Melford.

Besides this, he was the Author of several other Pamphlets, as

Observations on the Conduct of Mr Fox, 1794.

A Letter to Mr Skindon, 1794.

A second Letter to Mr Skindon, 1796. See sup^a h^o.

Thoughts on the Letter of Binspante, 1800.

Reply to the Monthly Reviewers, 1795.

He was also the Author of the following Poetical Pieces.

Collection of Trifles, 1797.

Critical Trifles, 1797.

The Abiad. 1815.

The Repicade.

The Foxiad.

Charles's Smale Clothes. 1800.

Last Trifles in Verse, 1813.

He also published a Sermon preached at the Abbees of Bury in 1803. — for which

See Suffolk Sermons, 4to. p. 12.

K France - Republic - Bonaparte

1804

1805

1806

1807

1808

1809

1810

1811

1812

1813

1814

1815

K. France - Republic - Bonaparte

THOUGHTS

ON THE

LETTER

OF

BUONAPARTE,

ON THE

PACIFIC PRINCIPLES,

AND

Last Speech of Mr. FOX.

By A SUFFOLK FREEHOLDER.

Rev. the Hon. the Earl of Sandwich, Sec. of State.

— VERBOSA ET GRANDIS EPISTOLA VENIT.

'Tis come—The Grand Pacificator's Letter;
Not Fox to Russia's Empress wrote a better.

London:

PRINTED BY GEORGE COOKE,

NO. 1, DUNSTON'S HILL, TOWER STREET,

FOR ROBERT BICKERSTAFF, THE CORNER OF
ESSEX-STREET, STRAND.

1800.

[Price 1s.]



THOUGHTS, &c.

AT the present crisis, which has been most appropriately called by Mr. Fox a new æra of the war, it cannot but be a great satisfaction to the people of this country to know, that the origin of it is at last clearly ascertained, and that the opposition of England, and the Tri-consulate of France, entertain precisely the same sentiments upon the subject. All the early rulers of that happy land of liberty, equality, and the unalienable rights of man, were in the constant habit of accusing each other of being the authors of the war, and never imputed that calamity to the administration of this country! Robespierre* and Chaumette charged it upon Brissot, and Brissot† retorted the charge. Robespierre expressly said, *“With what base hypocrisy the traitors insisted*

* Robespierre's Report, Nov. 17th, 1793.

† Brissot's last Address to his constituents.

"on certain pretended insults, said to have been offered to our ambassador;" and Brissot replied, "Who has been the author of this war? The anarchists only, and yet they make it a crime in us." The principal accusation against Brissot was, that he declared war abruptly against England, Holland, and all the powers which had not yet declared themselves; and Le Brun, the minister for foreign affairs in the first or second revolution, was sentenced to the guillotine for the same offence.

SUCH was the language, such the avowed sentiments of the former governors of France; they had candour enough to acquit our administration of a crime of which they knew themselves to be guilty; and sense enough to despise a desperate faction, which laboured to remove the odium of an unprovoked aggression from their enemies, and to fix it upon their countrymen. They laughed at the ingenuity and invention of our patriots, and would not, under any circumstances, adopt their ideas.

BUT Mr. Fox, satisfied, no doubt, of the truth he had so long maintained, was determined to carry conviction to the breasts even of his enemies, and with that perseverance, which

which is amongst the brightest ornaments of his character, pursued his point, till he has completely converted the new government of France to his opinions. Scorned and rejected by Robespierre and Brissot, he has at last happily succeeded with Buonaparte, and the Grand Consul, and Talleyrand, assert the charge of aggression on our part, as steadily, and believe it as firmly, as Mr. Fox and the Whig Club, or Mr. Hardy and the Corresponding Society.

NOR is the harmony of sentiment between the first personages of France and England, one in situation, the other in every public and private virtue, confined to the origin of the war, they are alike the friends of humanity, and the advocates of peace. The Grand Consul, with equal justice and modesty, assumes the title of the General Pacificator, and the Man of the People has always manifested a most eager and laudable ambition to deserve it. But it is rather singular, that, though his attachment to peace is as unquestionable as his love to his country, though he is constantly repeating with Cicero, "*Ego vel iniquissimam pacem justissimo bello antefero*," he has never been satisfied in a single instance,

with

with the terms on which hostilities have either been prevented or concluded.

IN the American war, when he was the leader of opposition, it was said, that he had a peace in his pocket; but, after his appointment to the secretaryship, it was by some unaccountable accident, lost or mislaid; and he thought it prudent and politic, to declare publicly, in his official capacity, that a peace must be made upon any terms, for a month, for a week, to give the nation time to breathe. Under this idea, not having the same horrors of despotism as he has at present, he supplicated the mediation of Russia, but the Empress cruelly rejected his suit; he then laid himself and his country at the feet of Holland, but their High Mightinesses were deaf to his supplications.

THE peace, however, which he was unable to make, the Marquis of Lansdowne concluded, and Mr. Fox reprobated it, without hesitation and without reserve, on account of the inadequacy of the terms, which he himself had occasioned. This, or his hatred of Lord Lansdowne, whom he was attempting to supplant, was the real reason of his opposition: he certainly did not abandon his pacific principles,
for

for he was at the time earnestly engaged in forming a treaty of alliance, offensive and defensive, with the late Earl of Guildford, whom he had long traduced in the most contumelious language, and declared "incapable of maintaining the customary relations of amity and peace."

IN 1790, two of our ships having been seized and detained in Nootka Sound by the Spaniards, who claimed the exclusive rights of sovereignty, navigation and commerce in those seas, government demanded restitution of the captured vessels, and such a full and adequate satisfaction, as the nature of the case required, and ordered the equipment of a strong and powerful fleet, to enforce the demand. The Court of Spain consented to give satisfaction for the injuries complained of; to restore the vessels, to indemnify the sufferers, and to admit our right to the southern whale fishery; and to navigate the Pacific Ocean, as well as to trade on the coasts of any part of North-West America, which had before been disputed and resisted. Mr. Fox, though as usual, the friend of peace, maintained that the reparation for the insults and injuries received was insufficient, and the arrangement for the prevention of future disputes insecure; and, in conformity with

with his opinion, many of the most enlightened politicians of the Whig Club, at the Shakespeare, the Crown and Anchor, and the London Tavern, impute the present war with Spain to the manifold imperfections of this treaty.

IN 1791, His Majesty, in conjunction with his allies, endeavoured to mediate a peace between Russia and the Porte, and, to add weight to the mediation, prepared a naval armament. Upon this memorable occasion, Mr. Fox gave an instance of patriotism and respect for the constitution, unparalleled, I hope and believe, in the history of this country: he not only openly espoused the cause of the Empress in parliament, but sent "his representative, with "his cypher, to St. Petersburg, * there to frustrate the objects, for which the minister of "the crown was authorized to treat. He succeeded in this his design, and did actually "frustrate the King's minister in some of the "objects of his negotiation. This proceeding of Mr. Fox, does not (as I conceive) "amount to absolute high treason: Russia, "though on bad terms, not having been then "declaredly at war with this kingdom. But "such a proceeding is, in law, not very re-

* Mr. Burke's Letter to the Duke of Portland.

"mote

“ mote from that offence, and is undoubtedly
 “ a most unconstitutional act, and an high-
 “ treasonable misdemeanor.

“ MR. FAWKENER * had been sent as an
 “ envoy extraordinary, to assist in the negocia-
 “ tion of the peace; and, about the same time,
 “ a gentleman, connected both by friendship
 “ and blood with the illustrious† leader of the
 “ opposition party, in the House of Commons,
 “ arrived at the court of St. Petersburg. What-
 “ ever was the object of his visit, whether to
 “ collect for his friend more accurate informa-
 “ tion, such as a statesman ought to use all fair
 “ means of obtaining, on so great a political
 “ question, relative to the balance of Europe,
 “ or any other purpose less laudable, his pre-
 “ sence there, was, by the empress, made the
 “ occasion of shewing a marked slight to the
 “ minister of our government. Whenever she
 “ spoke to the latter at her public court, she so
 “ contrived, as at the same time, to place the
 “ former on her right hand, in the station of
 “ honour; and on the conclusion of the peace,
 “ she gave presents exactly of the same kind
 “ to both, but of greater value, and with some

* Annual Register, 1791.

† Illustrious from ———, *ut luens a non lucendo.*

“ additional articles, to the representative of
 “ Mr. Fox.

“ WE * have noticed, in our former vo-
 “ lume, the part which a gentleman, allied to
 “ Mr. Fox, was supposed to have taken, rela-
 “ tive to the negotiations at the Court of St.
 “ Petersburg. Not only the circumstances of
 “ his appearance there, gave scope to unfavou-
 “ rable conjecture, but a letter, addressed by
 “ him to his illustrious relation in England, was
 “ reported to have fallen into the hands of
 “ ministry, which confirmed them in their for-
 “ mer suspicions. The contents of this letter
 “ were never publicly known; but legal opi-
 “ nions were said to have been taken, whether
 “ it did not afford sufficient grounds for a cri-
 “ minal prosecution. On mature considera-
 “ tion, however, either from motives of deli-
 “ cacy, as to the manner in which it had been
 “ obtained, or from a persuasion that it could
 “ only furnish a charge of imprudence, at most,
 “ against the writer, or of its inefficiency to
 “ prove any criminal approbation in the per-
 “ son for whom it was intended, the thought
 “ of an impeachment appears to have been re-
 “ linquished, although intimations of that kind
 “ were thrown out in the debates of the subse-

* Annual Register, 1792.

“ quent

“quent session. Previous, indeed, to the
 “meeting of parliament, the subject had been
 “so much rumoured abroad, that some strong
 “measure was generally expected to take
 “place.”

IN the autumn of 1792, neither Mr. Fox, nor His Majesty, had a resident ambassador at Paris, but the former was honoured with the correspondence of Mr. J. H. Stone*, “the brother of one of those † gentlemen who had been the object of the unjust and cruel persecution of the minister;” that is, had been tried for high-treason, and preserved from the gallows by the customary evidence, regularly produced upon every such occasion.

ON the 1st of February 1793, France declared war; on the 18th of the same month, Mr. Fox moved, that it was the duty of ministers to advise His Majesty against entering into any engagements with the combined powers; and, four days before the prorogation, pro-

* A letter of this man was produced on one of the State Trials, in which he says, “he had written to Fox at Newmarket.”

† This was the language of Mr. Fox on the Hustings, at the last Westminster Election, and applied to his convert Horne Tooke.

posed an address to His Majesty, desiring him to conclude an immediate peace with France. In the same righteous cause he has laboured long and incessantly ; motion after motion has he brought forward to attain this object ; urged ministers, again and again, to make proposals, and to induce their compliance, promised unequivocally to support the war, if fair and honourable terms were refused. Twice they were offered, twice rejected, and twice was Lord Malmesbury dismissed with disgrace. Mr. Fox forgot, or evaded his promise, and in 1797, when a mutiny raged in the fleet, and threatened its very existence, most patriotically seceded from his duty, to which he has never returned, but, I think, on four occasions. The first, was to irritate the people against the triple assessment ; the second, to support Mr. Grattan, (Neilson's friend) and the Anti-unionist's of Ireland ; the third, to bear willing and eager witness to the innocence of O'Connor, who confessed himself a traitor ; and the fourth, to recommend a peace with Buonaparte.

THESE instances are sufficient to prove the pacific principles of Mr. Fox ; those of the Grand Consul are not more equivocal. As soon as that illustrious Corsican had returned from the Ægyptian expedition, which he wisely planned,

planned, gallantly commanded, and at last nobly deserted, he renewed the oath of allegiance to the constitution, which he and his army had repeatedly sworn, by their consecrated banners and the manes of their slaughtered comrades, to maintain. The same day he overthrew it at the point of the bayonet, and erected in its stead, "another of the most stupendous* and glorious edifices of liberty, ever raised on the foundation of human integrity, in any time or country." Impatient for peace, he waited not the tardy acceptance of the people, but immediately wrote a letter to His Majesty, perhaps, in the language of Mr. Fox, to the Empress of Russia, or more probably, (as Mr. Whitbread, very sensibly observes) in the stile in which one crowned head writes to another. The dashes and decorations of the superscription,—French Republic,—Sovereignty of the People,—Liberty,—Equality, are pretty and new, and the allowance to the King, of two out of three of his titles, is uncommonly liberal.

HE begins his letter with stating, that he was called to the first magistracy by the wishes of the nation. This is generous to the people, but not just to the soldiers, who are entitled to,

* Mr. Fox spoke in this manner of the first French Constitution, and thinks the same of the three or four that have followed.

and

and claim the sole merit of his appointment. He asks his correspondent two pointed and pertinent questions about the eternity of the war, and the means of terminating it; one of which may be answered in the negative, the other in the affirmative; and proceeds to inform him, that he reigns over a free nation, and with the sole view of rendering it happy.

HERE Buonaparte shews complete ignorance of our internal situation; the nation is not free, the King has no view to its happiness; long have we known these melancholy truths, long have we been told from almost consular authority, that we ought to obey the laws no longer than we think it prudent, and advised, after the termination of the war, to turn our arms against our domestic tyrants and oppressors. And this is supposed to be one reason why some gentlemen are so strenuous in recommending peace.

THE Consul concludes his letter, with declaring, that this is the second time, in which he has sincerely desired to contribute efficaciously to a general pacification. The first time, it is thought, was after the treaty of Campo Formio, when, having made peace with the Emperor, he maintained that the existence of the
French

was French Republic, and of the British Government ~~were~~ incompatible, addressed his soldiers as the future army of England, and promised them laurels yet more glorious, to be plucked on the banks of the Thames.

THE King, very improperly, took no notice of this letter, but Lord Grenville's answer was long and detailed, and Talleyrand, in reply, accused this country of taking the lead in the insults and injuries offered to France, long before the war was declared, particularly by the dismissal of her accredited Minister.

IT has been observed before, that the present is the first of the French Rulers, who has adopted this charge, and it is supposed that he has agreed to it in order to conciliate the opposition, who have uniformly asserted it, and supported the cause of France upon hardly any other grounds. But Talleyrand's zeal for the honour of opposition, has in this instance, outrun his discretion, and impaired his recollection.

THE French declared war against the Emperor, on the 20th of April, 1792 ; and Chauvelin was sent ambassador to England with Talleyrand, associated in the mission. They brought
a con-

a confidential letter from Louis XVI. to His Majesty, in which he says, "I embrace this opportunity to express to your Majesty, how sensible I am of all the public marks of affection you have given me; I thank you for not having become a party to the concert, formed by certain powers against France."

IN an official note, delivered by Chauvelin to Lord Grenville, on the 12th of May, he details the reasons of the war with the Emperor, and in the name of his master, (who he says, is persuaded that his Britannic Majesty is not less ardently desirous than himself of seeing the good understanding and union of the two countries consolidated and strengthened) demands, in conformity to the treaty of navigation and commerce, an express prohibition to all his subjects, to exercise any act of hostility against France, and the ships of France. Lord Grenville in answer, gives his Majesty's direct and positive assurance of his readiness to fulfil, in the most exact manner, the stipulations of the treaty, and his determination to pay the strictest attention to the preservation of the good understanding subsisting between him and his most Christian Majesty.

IN

IN a second note of the 18th of June, Chauvelin, after expressing the sense, which the King entertained of the friendly dispositions, and of the sentiments of humanity, of justice, and of peace, manifested by his Britannic Majesty, desires his interference between the allied powers and France. Lord Grenville, in reply, says, that the same sentiments which have determined his Majesty not to take a part in the internal affairs of France, ought equally to induce him to respect the rights and independence of other sovereigns, and especially those of the allies; and that the intervention of his councils, or of his good offices, cannot be of use, unless desired by all the parties interested. The reply concludes with assurances of the wishes which his Majesty forms for the return of tranquillity, of the interest which he will always take in the happiness, and of the value which he attaches to the friendship, and to the confidence shewn him by his most Christian Majesty.

ON the 17th of August, Earl Gower was recalled from his embassy, because the executive power was withdrawn from the King, but was directed to declare his Majesty's determination to observe the principles of neutrality, in every thing which regarded the arrangement

c

of

of the internal government of France. This gave not the least umbrage to the ruling powers: Le Brun, the minister for foreign affairs, merely expressed his regret at the departure of his Lordship, and his satisfaction at the renewal of our assurances of neutrality.

THESE were the aggressions, these the injuries and intrigues of England, and these the testimonies of the French ministers, long after the war was begun with the Emperor.

THE charge of dismissing the accredited Minister of the Republic, is totally false. The fact is, that after the murder of Louis XVI. he was ordered to quit England, because the authority by which he had been sent was destroyed. The Convention, it is true, wished to accredit him, but Ministers had the virtue and wisdom, absolutely to reject him. He was, of course, no longer in a public character, but subject to the provisions of the alien bill, and it was well known at the time, that he was connected with the seditious societies, and in the confidence of an illustrious leader of opposition, who visited at his house, and spoke of him in very high terms as a man of honour, after he was
base

base enough, and brave enough, to offer to remain the ambassador of the murderers of his master.

THESE trifling inaccuracies are only mentioned to shew, that Talleyrand, the minister, has forgot the declarations of Talleyrand the ambassador; that he has made as Mr. Erskine did first in his pamphlet, and three years afterwards, in his speech, a convenient confusion of dates, and asserted for truth, as Therfites generally does, what he knew to be false.

BUT the mistakes of the minister, if they may be called by so harsh a name, afford no reason for rejecting the overtures of the Consul. Anxious, as unquestionably he is, for a general peace, he wishes to conclude it, by treating singly with the allies; and many of our most enlightened and dispassionate statesmen, equally convinced of the stability of his long established power and the sincerity of his professions, are decidedly for an immediate and separate negotiation. His condescending letter to the King, and the subsequent note of the voracious Talleyrand, have already produced the happiest effects, not merely the return for a day of our patriots to their duty, but a college * declama-

* These declamations are mostly miscellaneous, and, like his Grace's speech, suit one subject just as well as another.

tion from the Duke of Bedford, a phrenetic rhapsody from Lord Stanhope, a division of six peers in one instance, and of two in a second. Such is, even yet, the irresistible power of eloquence and reason.

IN the other House, Mr. Fox, in imitation of Mr. Erskine, made frequent appeals to the Speaker and the Deity, and solemnly declared, as he has for these seven years, that the war was a war of aggression against France. Obligated to give up the forged treaty of Pavia, which had long done him excellent service, he made the most of the treaty of Pilnitz, which had never been acted upon, but not finding it sufficient for his purpose, quoted, and falsely quoted * Bertrand de Moleville, to strengthen his argument

HE next denied, that, previous to the commencement of hostilities, any ground had been held out upon which peace could be preserved; not recollecting, or supposing the House did not recollect, that Lord Grenville had officially stated to Chauvelin the precise terms: they were, "that France should renounce her views of aggression and aggrandisement, and confine herself within her own territory, with-

* See his letter to Mr. Fox.

“out insulting other governments, without
 “disturbing their tranquillity, without violating
 “their rights.”

HE begged to be understood, once for all, that he was not the defender of the external or internal politics of the French revolution; they were all bad, bad as those of the House of Bourbon; her language was Bourbon like, her actions most Bourbon like.

AND is Mr. Fox's ardent admiration of the French revolution come at last to this? Is the constant theme of his most lavish panegyric, “the most stupendous and glorious edifice of liberty, which had ever been erected on the foundation of human integrity in any time or country,” no more than a Bourbon tyranny? Is the republic, one and indivisible, a detested despotism? and the mask, if she ever wore it, completely thrown away? It is, and the monster appears in all her deformity. And yet Mr. Fox, like a lover who doats upon an unworthy object, cannot, will not, shake off an attachment, which he knows degrades and disgraces him, nor emancipate himself from the shameful bondage: He extenuates all her crimes, he palliates all her atrocities.

THE

THE fortunate partition of Poland by the late despots of Austria and Russia, is continually reprobated, and adduced as an ample set-off against all the aggressions of France, past, present, and to come; against the seizure of Avignon, the incorporation of Savoy, the unwarrantable attacks upon the various States of Italy, the plunder of Rome, the extinction of the papal power, the conversion of Genoa and Tuscany into Republics, the revolutionising of Venice, and the transfer of it to Austria; the carnage and ruin of Switzerland, the invasion of Ægypt, and the massacre at Alexandria.

BUT, were despots always the objects of Mr. Fox's abuse and abhorrence? Never, till they were either the allies of his country, or the enemies of his favourite republic. In the war with America, when Louis the XVIth. assisted her, Mr. Fox, far from condemning, co-operated in that most Bourbon like act, and contributed largely to its fatal success.

WHEN His Majesty armed to prevent the aggrandizement of Russia, and the depression of the Porte, Mr. Fox, though he knew, or might have known from his ambassador at Petersburg, that the Empress was at that time, * me-

* Annual Register, 1791.

ditating

S
20
 dictating the dismemberment of Poland, declaring in Parliament, that * “ both in and out of office, he had always regarded Russia as a desirable ally for this kingdom. Russia of all the powers in Europe, scarcely excepting Holland, he conceived to be that power, with which the cultivation of reciprocal ties of friendship, both commercial and political, was most natural and most important.”

WHY then does Mr. Fox proscribe the Emperor Paul? Did he wade to the throne through the blood of his parents? Did he dismember Poland? Has he aggrandized himself at the expence of the Porte? *Nil horum*. He is the ally of England, he fights to overthrow the republic of France, and to restore Europe to the *status quo ante bellum*. These are crimes which Mr. Fox can never forgive, and he ridicules the magnanimity, misrepresents the motives, and calumniates the conduct of the Emperor.

NOR his is abuse confined to the Emperor: Suwarrow, the first general of the age, comes in for a share, and is vilified ostensibly, for the slaughter at Praga, in reality for having rescued Italy from the iron gripe of the French republic.

* Annual Register, 1792.

FAR different is his treatment of the Corsican Consul, and as he had maintained the new doctrine of the equality of man, to serve the cause of France, he adopts the old stoic's tenet of the equality of crimes, in defence of Buonaparte. He condemns alike

*Qui teneros caules alieni fregerit horti,
Et qui nocturnus Divûm sacra legerit,*

and affects to see no difference between the remonstrances of England, and the ravages of the Consul. He goes farther, and justifies all his enormities by English precedents, ancient and modern.

IF the Consul plundered the Duke of Tuscany; if he exacted a merciless contribution from Genoa; if he drenched Switzerland in blood; the English envoys were equally guilty, for they had used the strongest language, and declared the neutrality of these states highly criminal and even intolerable.

IF he broke the oaths of allegiance, so did the illustrious patriots who took up arms against Charles the First, and as it was undoubtedly a virtue in them, it cannot of course be a crime in the Consul. But Mr. Fox says, that he
thinks

thinks it would be better if all oaths of allegiance were laid aside, though they are binding only on certain conditions; he means, I presume, till the parties who take them, find it more convenient to break than to keep them.

It must be allowed, that Mr. Fox is very happy in the instance he has selected, and that he and the Consul, have exactly the same ideas of the use and obligation of oaths, as the illustrious patriots had in the glorious days of the Protectorate. I appeal to the authority of Hudibras, to determine the question :

Did not our worthies of the House,
 Before they broke the peace, break vows?
 For having freed us, first from both
 Th' allegiance and supremac oath,
 Did they not next compel the nation
 To take and break the protestation?
 To swear, and after to recant
 The solemn league and covenant?
 To take th' engagement and disclaim it,
 Enforc'd by those who first did frame it?
 Did they not swear at first to fight
 For the King's safety and his right,
 And after march'd to find him out,
 And charg'd him home with horse and foot;

D

But

But yet still had the confidence
 To swear it was in his defence ?
 Did they not swear to live and die
 With Essex, and straight laid him by ?
 If that were all, for some have sworn
 As false as they, if th' did no more.
 Did they not swear to maintain law,
 In which that swearing made a flaw ?
 For Protestant Religion vow,
 That did that vowing disallow ?
 For Privilege of Parliament,
 In which that swearing made a rent ?
 And since of all the three, not one
 Is left in being, 'tis well known.
 Did they not swear in exprefs words,
 To prop and back the House of Lords ?
 And after turn'd out the whole House full
 Of Peers as dangerous, and unuseful ?
 So Cromwell, with deep oaths and vows,
 Swore all the Commons out of the House,
 Vow'd that the Red-Coats would disband,
 Ay, marry would they, at their command ;
 And troll'd them on, and swore, and swore,
 Till th' army turn'd them out of door.
 This tells us plainly what they thought,
 That oaths and swearing go for nought,
 And that by them, th' were only meant
 To serve for an expedient.

If oaths can do a man no good
 In his own business, why they should
 In other matters do him hurt,
 I think there's little reason for't.
 He that imposes an oath, makes it,
 Not he that for convenience takes it;
 Then how can any man be said
 To break an oath he never made.

It is evident, I think, that our ancestors
 were no novices in the art and mystery of oaths,
 and in common justice to the Consul, it must
 be confessed, that though he swore terribly, it
 was nothing to this; the Oliverians beat him
 hollow.

But, if he is an usurper, so also was Crom-
 well. Here, however, the Consul takes the
 lead, and the star of Cromwell "dims its inef-
 fectual light" before the rising splendour of Ali
 Buonaparte. Cromwell, thwarted and opposed
 in all his designs, had no alternative but to
 seize the government, or to sink into a private
 citizen; he determined on the former, and suc-
 ceeded in the daring attempt. This was not
 the case with the Corsican. The constitution
 which he had established, was the same as he
 left it; the Directory were all his friends, and
 Barras, whose strumpet he married, was still his

patron and protector. They received him with open arms, upon his triumphant return from the Ægyptian expedition; like Xerxes, in a single skiff, heaped upon him every distinction, and destined him to the most important commands. He immediately renewed his oaths, displaced his patron, subverted the constitution, and ascended the throne of the Bourbons.

A FOREIGNER, A CORSICAN, A MILITARY ADVENTURER, THE HUSBAND OF BARRAS'S* MISTRESS, IS SUPERIOR TO LOUIS THE XIVTH. IN THE PLENITUDE OF HIS POWER; HE IS THE LORD OF THE REPUBLIC, ONE AND INDIVISIBLE; THE SOVEREIGN OF THE SOVEREIGN PEOPLE, AND OF THE GREAT NATION, WITH HER FOUR AND TWENTY MILLIONS OF NATIVE INHABITANTS.

BUT Mr. Fox contended, that, as the usurpation of Cromwell was permanent, and Augustus Cæsar established a military despotism, that lasted many hundred years, there was every reason to expect the stability of the Cor-

* Barras and Mrs. Buonaparte;
 Hero and Heroine, whom these times adore,
 Tho' plainer times would call them Rogue and ———,
 fican's.

fican's. With a happy mixture of irony and argument, he ridiculed all the idle pretences of ministers, the childish idea of waiting for experience and the evidence of facts, the unnecessary solicitude for our own and the future security of Europe; the absurdity of not treating but in conjunction with our allies, the folly of restoring the conquered countries to their former possessors, and the injustice of cooping up the Great Nation, and the Grand Consul, within the old narrow limits of the French empire. These, he thought, were at best, secondary considerations, and pressed the House to agree to an immediate negociation, because it was the wish and interest of the Consul, whose sincerity was, undoubted, to make and preserve peace.

THESE *, amongst a variety of others, were the arguments of Mr. Fox, and though they failed to convince a corrupt majority, they converted † three sensible senators. This he

* Morning Post, February 4th.

† Since this pamphlet went to the press, the city of London has been converted, and presented a Petition, as numerously as respectably signed, to the House of Commons. And yet Ministers, in defiance of six Peers, sixty-three Commoners, and fifty-two Livery-men, are determined to pursue an unjust, unnecessary, and unpopular war.

acknow-

acknowledged with great modesty, the next day, at the Whig Club; but notwithstanding such unprecedented success, he has again seceded, and left his party and his profelytes to take care of themselves and the nation.

It is, however, earnestly to be hoped, but, I am afraid, not much to be expected, that the people of this country, tired at last of a war, which has no other object than the restoration of the Bourbon family, to oppose which we have incurred half of our debt, and to support which the remainder,

So ***** says, and ***** never lies, will recal our Cincinnatus, or rather Linnæus, from his retirement, and invest him with the prerogative, which has been so long abused. This might be done with the greatest ease, if they would only exert their undoubted right to change their government, and to substitute a Triconsulate for the present No-constitution.

THEN might the Man of the People be appointed, by acclamation, First Consul; the Abbe Horne Tooke, second; and his Grace of ——— *more* Roger Ducos, would make an excellent bag of cotton to prevent the contact
and

and collision of his porcelain confederates. Then too would the Corsican Consul, unless he adds ingratitude and perfidy to the other republican virtues, grant peace upon the fairest and most honourable terms, and France and England, no longer rivals and enemies, but friends and allies, unite in the closest ties of amity and fraternity for ever.

Finis.

18 JA 53